

REMARKS

This response is being filed in reply to a Communication from the Examiner dated September 23, 2005, in which certain informalities in the previously-submitted amendment affecting claims 1, 7, 9, 16, 17, 21, 24, 30 and 31 are noted. These informalities were due to the inadvertent reintroduction of language in claims 1 and 24 that had been previously corrected by way of supplemental amendment. The reintroduced language caused the remaining claims amendments to not be entered. Through inadvertence, the correction of the recitation of "position" at line 3 of claims 1 and 24 to production was dropped and "position" was incorrectly reintroduced at line 3 of claims 1 and 24. The word position has hereby been replaced in line 3 of claims 1 and 24 with the word production, consistent with the previously entered amendments of claims 1 and 24.

Additional claim amendments were not entered by Examiner because of the error with claims 1 and 24. Those amendments have been again presented herein and comprise the following.

Claims 1, 7, 16 and 24 are amended to recite that the chimeric isoprenoid synthase polypeptide includes therein a ratio-determinant domain that influences the relative ratio of reaction products generated by the chimeric isoprenoid synthase polypeptide. Support for this limitation is found, e.g., at page 15, lines 7-8 of the specification.

New claims 30 and 31, dependent on claims 1 and 7 respectively, introduce the structural limitation that the DDXXD motif coordinates a metal cofactor that is necessary to neutralize the diphosphate moiety of farnesyl pyrophosphate in an otherwise lipophilic pocket. This is supported by the specification, e.g., at page 15, lines 17-19.

These amendments are introduced to further clarify the relationships between structure and function of these chimeric proteins. Accordingly, these amendments introduce

no new matter and are fully supported by the specification. Therefore, entry of these amendments is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-31 are currently pending in the above-identified application and remain for consideration.

Claims 3 and 12 are allowed.

Claims 1-2, 4-11, and 13-29 had previously been rejected under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 as lacking written description in the specification. This rejection had been respectfully traversed in Applicants' response submitted on March 28, 2005, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to consider these arguments.

Claims 1-2, 4-11, and 13-29 had previously been rejected under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 as lacking enablement in the specification. This rejection had been respectfully traversed in Applicants' response submitted on March 28, 2005, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to consider these arguments.

Reexamination of the application as amended, reconsideration of the rejections, and allowance of the claims not already allowed are respectfully requested.

The Communication of September 23, 2005 set a one-month period for response. A one-month extension of time is being filed herewith. Accordingly, this Response is being filed in a timely manner.


This response is being filed in accordance with recently revised 37 C.F.R. § 1.121, as set forth in 68 F.R. 38611 (June 30, 2003). If the amendment is considered to be not in compliance with recently revised 37 C.F.R. § 1.121, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at Examiner's earliest possible convenience.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to consider the arguments previously submitted and allow the claims as amended.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 9, 2005

CATALYST LAW GROUP, APC  
9710 Scranton Rd.  
Suite 170  
San Diego, California 92121  
(858) 200-0582  
(858) 450-9834 (Fax)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeff Landes, Esq.  
Reg. No. 55,355